HUMAN EVENTS

Volume XII, No. 53 Saturday, December 31, 1955 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

The Big Decision: GOP Chairman Len Hall and friends continue their happy "Ike's going to run" refrain, but other Republicans perceive definite dangers ahead and are not happy at all. Thus, John S. Knight, publisher of the Knight Newspapers (Chicago, Detroit, Akron, Miami and Charlotte), comes out with a warning editorial entitled "The GOP's Great Error."

Knight is a long-time personal friend and supporter of the President and a staunch Republican. He starts out, "The Republicans, it seems to me, are making a monumental mistake in permitting the country to assume that President Eisenhower will be a candidate for re-election. . . . When House Minority Leader Joe Martin, Republican Chairman Leonard Hall and a host of minor GOP luminaries keep assuring one and all that Ike will run, they are making an assumption which is not supported by anything more tangible than their self-interest." And Knight goes on, "It is folly to pretend that the President is not a sick man. Granted that he is making a satisfactory recovery, for which we all rejoice, it cannot be safely assumed that the President is, or will be, able to carry the burdens of his high office."

The famous publisher speaks of a "plot" to surround Ike "with bluff and hearty well wishers like Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks, a former heart case, to prove that a coronary is not much worse than a bad cold."

Knight sharply assails the "holding policy" of postponing a decision on running again until a late date, when such procrastination would work against any other GOP candidates. He emphasizes that "President Eisenhower cannot transfer his popularity to another." He concludes that "the politicians should let Ike alone."

This outburst from an intimate friend of the President has startled many in the Capital. Some observers recall that Knight, once before, defied party complacency and spoke up — in the campaign of 1952. Late in August of that year, Knight joined with the Scripps-Howard chain of papers in prodding the Ike campaign directors into life. Scripps papers said "Ike is running like a dry creek," a remark that became a sensation. It was after this that Taft was called in and a deal made which ensured support of the party right-wing; and other aggressive tactics were started, leading to the victory in November, 1952.

Nor is Knight alone. A number of GOP observers are increasingly worried lest, if Ike decides to run, the Democrats will exploit the dangers of electing a man with a recent coronary history. This week, Roscoe Drummond, a "liberal" commentator who often serves as a bellwether of the "liberal" flock — talks of Ike seeking a "four-year contract with the American people." Such phraseology inspires thoughtfulness in anyone aware of the uncertainties of heart trouble. Last week, a physician writing in the letter column of the *Chicago Tribune* recalled that former President Coolidge went into Walter Reed Hospital (in 1933) and was pronounced in "fine shape." He died suddenly a few days later — of a coronary thrombosis! Washingtonians recall the many months of President Woodrow Wilson's last term when he was paralyzed and his government paralyzed with him. Finally, whatever Dr. White may say about the condition of the heart itself, it is difficult to minimize a current pointed observation — "It's not the work, it's the worry."

All the above historical precedents — Republicans realize — provide handy tools for Democratic

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

polemists. (Even if Democratic politicos refrain from utilizing them, Democratic columnists can do far greater damage with a few well-chosen phrases.) Senator Wayne Morse, now a Democrat, this week declared: "If we do not put an end, at the next election, to Government by regency in the United States, we will greatly weaken executive responsibility and the administration of Government as contemplated by the Constitution." And the *New York Post* (December 21), in an editorial entitled "Why Ike Should Not Run," threw off the catchy quip, "the country cannot be run on the principle of calculated medical risk and the risk is inescapable unless Ike, in effect, agrees to abdicate the functions of the presidency after winning the office . . . an image of the President putting and puttering around the White House while others run the country for him."

Republicans, of course, could retort that the Democrats in 1944 did the same thing, with the ailing Roosevelt. But, such remarks as made by the *New York Post* may make much headway with the "man-in-the-Street" and the "independent voters." It's a portent.

Not Merely Gossip: Observers in Washington have been seeking the source of the colossal blunders which the U.S. recently committed in the handling of the UN admission of new members, "the package deal," etc. After much probing, they come up with the claim that "the package deal" was thought up in no other place than the State Department itself — specifically in the Department's Division of International Organization Affairs. This Division has reportedly harbored a number of staffers who formerly served in the wartime Treasury Department under the famous Harry Dexter White. It is believed that members of Congress will try to investigate this lead and may clamor for a "cleanout" of this Division of State.

● The gulf that yawns between conservative and radical leaders in the merged AFL-CIO labor federation is illustrated by a story which AFL head George Meany himself tells his friends — as much in complaint as in surprise at his colleague, CIO head, Walter Reuther. Meany, who has won his spurs long since as a thorough-going anti-Communist, relates that he emphasized to Reuther the necessity of the federation pursuing a militant anti-Communist policy. But Reuther, according to Meany, only replied that perhaps it would be wiser if the AFL-CIO should simply be "non-Communist" and not take stands of an anti-Communist nature. Friends, who have heard the hefty Meany tell the story, draw the conclusion that the AFL leader is already getting fed up with the CIO man.

● Perhaps, as a result of the increasing talk that Ike will announce his candidacy for re-election, there is afloat a suggestion that the second place on his ticket should be — not Nixon, but Thomas E. Dewey, former governor of New York and two-time loser for the Presidential election.

Letter from FRAZIER HUNT, Author: "If someone should ask me what I considered the most significant and indispensable publication in America I would have to say HUMAN EVENTS."

Reds in the Press: Advance word on the next hearings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee includes a forecast they will reveal that press coverage of subversive stories has been slanted by left-wing reporters. On January 4, the Senate committee under Senator Eastland, Chairman, is slated to air such matters and the witnesses — who may or may not take cover under the Fifth Amendment — will be newspaper and radio reporters and writers. Reports say that most of those called before the committee will be present or past employees of the *New York Times*. The most important of all American dailies, once considered a paragon of objective news handling, has for some years been criticized for partiality in some of its news reporting. It is understood that in the coming hearings an explanation of the scarcely impartial reporting of the McCarthy probes will be brought out.

These projected hearings have inspired a great deal of behind-the-scenes discussion in press circles. Assertions have been frequently made that pressure has been exerted on committee Senators

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to suppress this investigation of the press. If the hearings are held and in the most free and unimpeded manner, it is believed that no little dismay will spread throughout the publishing world of the country. Friends of the Senate committee speculate on the possibility of a press campaign to discredit the committee and they point to signs among some sections of the press. While the *Times* itself has virtually ignored the matter, two other metropolitan dailies — the *New York Post* and the *Washington Post*, both "liberal" organs — have started to comment critically on the scheduled hearings. The show opens next Wednesday, January 4 — at least, today, that is the official word.

ILO: On the eve of the return of Congress, congressional staffers are looking for unpopular requests for appropriations to eliminate and, it is widely agreed, they could well start with money put up for the socialistic International Labor Organization of Geneva, Switzerland, of which the U.S. share amounts to $1,750,000 annually. The opportunity for a paring job is all the better for two reasons: (1) there is a move under way to raise the U.S. contributions to ILO to $3,000,000 a year; and (2) the U.S. employer delegate to the ILO for many years has issued a scathing attack on the organization. That delegate is W. L. McGrath, a Cincinnati businessman who has represented the U.S. at the Geneva organization since 1949.

McGrath, in a recent statement, recommended that not only U.S. employers but also the U.S. Government refrain from sending delegations to the ILO and granting it further financial support. The immediate reason for Mr. McGrath's revolt against the ILO stems from the more aggressive policies of the Soviet Union and Soviet satellite delegations in the ILO since 1954. Mr. McGrath particularly objected to the presence of what the Iron Curtain countries termed "businessmen" delegates to the Geneva meetings. Obviously, the so-called employer delegates from the Communist countries are simply government agents and *per se* agents for the Communist Party. McGrath led the fight in 1954 and 1955 to get these "employer" delegates thrown out of the ILO, but was overruled by the majority of the ILO. "At the 1955 conference," says McGrath, "I withdrew the United States employer delegation from participation in any ILO working committees upon which Communist so-called employers had been seated."

The U.S. in the ILO today finds itself very much in the minority. The Iron Curtain countries now have a total of 32 votes within the ILO to 4 from the U.S. McGrath until recently entertained some hope that the ILO would disqualify the Communist worker and employer delegates. But today, he sees no such possibility and envisages the future of the ILO as one of "just another Communist-dominated organization." Hence, his statement and recommendation — that the U.S. should get out of the ILO and give it no more money — will undoubtedly have a powerful effect on the next session of Congress.

Only if your order for a 1955 bound volume (fully indexed) is mailed during the next 7 days can you get it at the pre-publication price of $7.50. After that the price will be $15. *All 1954 bound volumes have now been sold.*

Right to Work: A highly important case has reached the Supreme Court of the United States. That judicial body has agreed to review a conflict between the Nebraska right-to-work law and the Federal Railway Labor Act which authorizes economic compulsion to union membership. The case before the Court is that of five employees of the Union Pacific Railway in Nebraska. The men refuse to join the AFL Brotherhood of Railway Clerks. Nebraska has a clause in its constitution outlawing contracts which make union membership a condition of employment.

Recently the Nebraska Supreme Court upheld the state's right-to-work law. The decision noted that compulsory membership would in some instances "compel support, financial and otherwise, of policies which an employee might deem objectionable from the standpoint of free government and the liberties of the individual under it. To compel an employee to make involuntary contributions, from his compensation, for such purposes is a taking of his property without due process of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

law. An employee not only has a right to work, but he has the right to have his earnings protected against confiscation against his will."

"Parkinson's Law" — How Bureaucracy Grows: Politicians assume that a rising number of bureaucrats must reflect a growing volume of work. Cynics imagine that the multiplication of officials leaves some of them idle.

The fact is that the number of officials and the quantity of the work to be done are not related to each other at all. According to what the London *Economist* facetiously calls "Parkinson's Law," the number of bureaucrats will rise whether the volume of work increases, diminishes or even disappears. Two factors are responsible: (I) Officials want to multiply subordinates, not rivals; and (II) Officials make work for each other.

When a bureaucrat (called A) finds himself overworked — whether for real or imaginary reasons — he has three remedies: (1) he may resign; (2) he may ask to halve the work with a colleague called B; and (3) he may demand the assistance of two subordinates, to be called C and D. Of course, he won't resign. To turn over half his work to B would be to create a rival. So he takes the third choice. He hires C and D. Three officials are now doing what one did before. This is where Factor II comes into operation. These three make so much work for each other that all are fully occupied and A is actually working harder than ever. When a document comes in, A decides that it falls within the province of D who places a draft reply before C who amends it drastically and, since he is going on leave, hands the file to his vacation replacement (called "H"), who lays the new version before A.

"A" reads it through, corrects the English — none of these young men can write grammatically — and finally rewrites it, producing the same reply he would have written if officials C and D and H had never been born.

How Parkinson's Law works is illustrated by the British Navy, says the *Economist*. The 2,000 Admiralty officers of 1914 became 3,569 in 1928, though the Navy diminished during that period by one-third in men and two-thirds in ships. The 8,118 Admiralty officers of 1935 became 33,788 by 1954, though the number of ships and seamen continued to decline.

The staff of the British Colonial Office affords an even better study, since the decline of the Empire has been even greater than the decline in the size of the Navy:

Colonial Office Officials

1935	1939	1943	1947	1954
372	450	817	1,139	1,661

These increases, while paralleling those observed in other departments, has nothing to do with the size — or even the existence — of the vanishing British Empire.

A mass of statistics has now been accumulated as to the time likely to elapse between a given official's appointment and the later appointment of two or more assistants. Parkinson's Law says that an administrative staff will grow at the rate of no less than 5¾ per cent per year even if the volume of useful work remains the same or even disappears completely.

Washington observers of the operations of government says that a President determined to neutralize the workings of Parkinson's Law, could cut the government civilian payroll (now 2,362,000) by 400,000 — without eliminating a single service performed by the government — and the saving would be at least $3 billion. Since personal income taxes now yield $30 billions a year, a $3 billion saving would make possible a saving of 10 per cent in the personal income tax of all taxpayers.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

Pre-publication price *(only until December 31)* on 1955 BOUND ANNUAL VOLUME with complete index, $7.50. After January 1, $15.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3. By first class mail, $11.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $13 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $12 a year; airmail, $18. **Allow us 2 weeeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.**

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1955.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XII, No. 53 HUMAN EVENTS December 31, 1955

Article Section

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOLS

By ROGER A. FREEMAN

This article is an extract from the best-selling and most-quoted booklet of the season: "Federal Aid to Education — Boon or Bane?" Priced at $1, it is published by the American Enterprise Association, 1012 14th St., N.W., Washington, D. C.

THE DISCREPANCIES in fiscal capacity among states still are substantial. Disposable income per child varies from $9,680 in New York to $2,810 in Mississippi, a ratio of 3.5:1. The real discrepancy is not as much as this would indicate. A dollar buys more education in the low-income states. The cost of building classrooms is less. Teachers' salaries are geared to the general earnings, salary levels, standards of living and the cost of public and private services in the respective states.

The expenditure level in a state or district does not necessarily equal or indicate the quality of its education. Although there have been attempts to prove that it does, there is much evidence to the contrary. In Utah, for example, school expenditures per pupil over the past twenty years have been from one-half to two-thirds of those in New York. Yet, by customary yardsticks, the average educational level in Utah is much higher than in New York, as demonstrated in the National Education Association's booklet, "Educational Differences Among States."

Would "Poor" States Get More From Federal Aid Than the "Rich"?

At the October, 1954, school construction hearings of the House Education and Labor Committee, the Executive Secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers stated, ". . . the trend of thinking is toward the flat-grant idea and away from the other idea of extreme equalization. . . ." When asked how he rationalized this position he replied, "We all rationalize, but I hate to admit it. . . ." Beardsley Ruml also rationalized this position in his speech at the San Francisco meeting of the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools on March 19, 1954, by saying that "a child in a wealthier state is a child of the United States just the same and deserves identical federal support." This confuses the issue. A child in a wealthier state, to have an educational opportunity, does *not* need identical federal support. It might be hard to prove that the citizens of states like New York, Connecticut or Illinois are financially unable to provide for the education of their children. If they were, where would the federal government raise the money?

What Mr. Ruml probably meant to imply — but did not say in so many words — is that a vote in New York is just as valuable as one in Mississippi. Representative Carroll Kearns of Pennsylvania clarified the motivating forces at the Senate hearings in January, 1955:

> It is quite obvious to me that we cannot, in the House especially, pass a bill that is going to give an allotment to children of certain states of $22.14 and then

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

come down to some of our high-paying revenue states and have a remuneration of child allotment that goes as low as $7.23 per pupil. I think all of us recognize that the needs are different in all of the states, but at the same time you cannot ask members of Congress to come down here and vote for some type of formula whereby their states and their districts are going to pay the bill for other states to benefit by. I believe that charity begins at home . . .

This exposes the flat-grant federal aid plans as what they really are: not efforts to help some boys and girls in areas with insufficient educational opportunities to eliminate some of the educational slums, nor assistance to states which are unable to provide schools, but pork barrel schemes, plain and simple.

Congressmen from well-to-do states know that their constituents will give them little credit for having helped build schools for some underprivileged boys and girls in Alabama or Mississippi. They also know that if they can build a new auditorium for the local high school with federal money, they may well be rewarded at the polls with their political acumen praised as the apex of statecraft in home-town newspapers.

The national groups which are lobbying for federal aid know that much of their membership resides in high-income states, and will not thank them for getting federal money for others. As Congressman Kearns expressed it so well, "charity begins at home."

The Kelley Bill (The Flat-Grant Principle)

The bill which emerged from the House Education and Labor Committee in the summer of 1955 (H.R. 7535 by Representative Augustine Kelley of Pennsylvania), with an approving vote of 21 to 9, authorizes $1.6 billion in federal aid to school construction. This sum is to be allocated over a four-year period on a basis of $11.30 per school-age child per year to all states. If enacted, this bill would do little to help cure school building shortages. About half the federal appropriations — $764 million — would go to the 14 wealthiest states. Only one-fourth — $412 million — would go to the 14 poorest states. This method of allocation obviously is motivated not by the extent of school building needs but perhaps by a strategic consideration: the 14 wealthiest states control 53% of the votes in the House of Representatives, the 14 poorest states only 23%.

Would this bill help the needy states?

Alabama, whose state department of education listed its school building deficit at $334 million, would receive $38 million over the next four years. New Mexico, which listed its deficit at $144 million, would be allocated $9 million. North Carolina, with a stated deficit of $303 million, would be eligible for $49 million.

What would the bill do for the well-to-do states?

California listed its school building needs at $2.1 billion, its resources at $1.5 billion, leaving a deficit of $600 million. The Kelley bill would grant California $106 million over the next four years. Would this make the difference between a critical classroom shortage and acceptable conditions?

The amount of $1.6 billion would be sufficient to help in the poorest states if the funds were channeled only to the regions where the worst conditions exist. But that is clearly not the purpose of this legislation.

If it is assumed that school building needs total $10 billion — and there is an "if" to that — and they are to be met, then either the states must put forth greater efforts than they are now exerting or the federal government must appropriate far greater amounts than $400 million for each of the next four years. A bill by Repre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sentative Kearns (H.R. 10052, 83rd Congress) quite logically authorized $5 billion. But it was apparently felt that it would be better strategy to seek passage of a bill with a lower total and raise the amounts later on, after the principle of federal school aid had been established by law.

The proponents of federal aid regard $400 million a year, as set forth in the Kelley bill, only as a down payment which would have to be boosted to $1 billion or more per year within a short time. They are probably right. Once the principle of federal responsibility for the schools is established it will be easy to prove that such small amounts as $400 million a year are merely a drop in the bucket and will have to be upped.

Would Federal Aid Bring Federal Control?

In a foreword to the booklet "Educational Differences Among States" in 1954, Dr. William G. Carr, the executive secretary of the National Education Association, wrote:

> What we ask is a minimum standard below which no school would be allowed to sink, a guarantee to every American child that he shall have at least a minimum acceptable educational opportunity, no matter where he happens to live. This minimum cannot be effectively guaranteed without federal aid to schools.

Can such a minimum be guaranteed without federal control? The answer of the organized educational groups has been a loud and ringing affirmative. Others doubt it.

Dr. S. M. Brownell, the present U.S. Commissioner of Education, wrote in 1939:

> On the one hand, we have presented to us arguments that there will be no federal control accompanying federal aid. Alongside, we find evidence showing the inadequacy and inequality of education in states able to support a good educational program, and evidence of inefficient or inadequate efforts by these states to eradicate inequality and inefficiency within their borders. If there is to be little or no federal control accompanying federal aid, what right have we to expect a major improvement of the education within states under the same leadership that they now have? Thus, if federal aid is to bring about better schools, it seems apparent that there must be some federal control.

A former U.S. Commissioner of Education, Dr. John J. Tigert, wrote:

> My experience in handling federal subsidies for education under the limited acts which are now in existence has taught me that you must either have federal control and interference or you must have misappropriation of funds and waste. . . . Reason and experience both indicate that federal money cannot be expended wisely and efficiently except by exercising federal control and supervision; even then there is considerable waste. . . . If we embark upon a program of turning over federal money to schools without any strings attached, it is only a question of time until the waste, extravagance and misuse of these funds will result in a reaction or a change. The alternative is federal control.

President Roosevelt's Advisory Committee on Education wrote in 1938:

> It is also true that the proposed grants will largely fail of their purpose of providing more equitable opportunities if suitable procedures are not adopted to insure distribution within the states in conformity with that purpose since great inequalities of educational opportunity exist within all states. The Committee is of the opinion that the distribution of federal funds within a state is not a matter that should be left exclusively to state

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

officials, in view of the source of the funds and the purpose for which the grants are recommended.

The Education Committee of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations wrote in 1954:

> If states cannot find ways to allocate almost $3 billion in state aid in such a way as to assure adequate educational opportunity, what reason do we have to assume that they would accomplish the objective with a few hundred million dollars in federal funds? Federal action could bring about universal educational opportunity only if grants-in-aid were conditioned upon control of distribution of both state and federal funds.

The Committee concluded:

> The federal government could not achieve universal educational opportunity by appropriating money to the states to be distributed at their discretion.

In most states the school organization is fragmentized into many hundreds — in 20 states over one thousand — school districts. Unnecessarily small districts and a narrow tax base often are the cause of much of the financial difficulty of local school systems. These districts sometimes are kept alive only by state aid without which they would have to yield to economic pressure and consolidate. If federal aid were to be made available, should it be used to support and prolong the life of such uneconomical districts or should it be used to force communities into a more efficient organization? Either alternative will meet with resistance.

The proponents of federal aid know, of course, that federal control would be unacceptable to most states and that the mere thought is repugnant to their own groups. Two representative educational committees of the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators wrote in 1945:

> . . . the trend toward the federalizing of education is one of the most dangerous on the current American scene . . .

If education becomes federalized in the United States it will not be because the people want this to happen. At no one time will they clearly and decisively take action to make the national government the predominant agent of educational control.

Rather, national control of schools will come by a process of accretion and infiltration. This is how it has happened thus far. It will come, not because the people approve a policy of gradually shifting predominant educational control from the states and localities to the nation. Rather it will result from responses to many small emergencies and from the pressures of many special interests. No one Presidential directive nor piece of Congressional legislation affecting education will be decisive in itself. The final outcome, however, will be to transfer major educational control to the national government. In short, the federalization of education in the United States, if it occurs, will not be the fulfillment of a policy consciously adopted after mature deliberation by the majority of the American people. Rather, it will happen by default. It will result from failure to give this important matter the attention and thought it deserves. . . .

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $20; 1,000 for $30. In quantities of 5,000 or more, $20 per thousand.

ROGER A. FREEMAN is Special Assistant to Governor Arthur B. Langlie of the State of Washington.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

end

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED